	Case 1:22-cv-00419-KES-CDB Docu	ument 77	Filed 08/06/25	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	MICHAEL JACE,	Cas	e No.: 1:22-cv-0041	9-KES-CDB (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS		
13	v.	CEI	CERTAIN CLAIMS FOLLOWING SCREENING OF PLAINTIFF'S SECOND		
14	MARGARET LIRONES, et al.,		AMENDED COMPLAINT		
15	Defendants.	Doc	2. 73		
16					
17	Plaintiff Michael Jace is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action				
18	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge				
19	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.				
20	On April 11, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations				
21	which recommended that the Court dismiss plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment procedural due				
22	process claim but allow plaintiff to proceed on his First Amendment retaliation claim. Doc. 73.				
23	The parties were given fourteen days to file objections. <i>Id</i> . On May 5, 2025, plaintiff filed a				
24	document titled "Objections" that contained no substantive arguments but noted that plaintiff that				
25	had responded to the findings and recommendations in order to preserve his right to appeal. Doc.				
26	74.				
27					
28	///				
	11				

1	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de			
2	novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court concludes that the			
3	findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.			
4	Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:			
5	1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 11, 2025, Doc. 73, are ADOPTED			
6	IN FULL;			
7	2. This action may proceed only on plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation claims			
8	against defendants Peterson, Scaife, and Cid, in their individual capacities only, as			
9	alleged in the second amended complaint;			
10	3. The remaining claims in the second amended complaint are DISMISSED; and			
11	4. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.			
12				
13				
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
15	Dated: August 6, 2025 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE			
16	GMILD STATES DISTRICT SUDGE			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

Case 1:22-cv-00419-KES-CDB Document 77 Filed 08/06/25 Page 2 of 2